

### **Remarks**

This Amendment responds to the Office Action ("the Action") mailed June 29, 2005. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 44-66 are pending in the application. No claims have been allowed. Claims 44, 56, 57, 65, and 66 are independent.

### ***Cited Art***

U.S. Patent No. 6,237,030 to Adams et al. ("Adams") is entitled "Method for Extracting Hyperlinks from a Display Document and Automatically Retrieving and Displaying Multiple Subordinate Documents of the Display Document."

U.S. Patent No. 6,219,679 to Brisebois ("Brisebois") is entitled "Enhanced User-Interactive Information Content Bookmarking."

U.S. Patent No. 6,344,865 to Matthews et al. ("Matthews") is entitled "User Friendly Remote System Interface with Menu Scrolling."

U.S. Patent No. 5,499,334 to Staab ("Staab") is entitled "Method and System for Displaying Window Configuration of Inactive Programs."

### ***Amendments***

Claims 44, 46-48, 51, 54-56, 57, 59, and 64-66 have been amended to clarify differences over the cited art. No new matter is added by these claims. No other claims have been amended.

### ***Patentability of Claims 44-66 over Adams, Xia, and others under § 103***

The Action rejects claims 44-46, 51-52, 54-59, and 63-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Adams in view of Brisebois. The Action also rejects claims 47, 49-50, 60-62, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Adams in view of Brisebois and further in view of Staab. The Action rejects claims 48 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Adams in view of Brisebois and further in view of Matthews.

Applicants respectfully submit the claims in their present form are allowable over the cited art. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the

knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (MPEP § 2142.)

#### Claim 44

Independent claim 44, as amended, recites in part:

while displaying a plurality of user-selected web pages, the web pages being displayed according to user-selected display configuration settings and the display configuration settings including at least in part indications of portions of the web pages to be displayed, *receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication from a user to store a snapshot of the plurality of web pages;*

*after receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication, storing the snapshot of the plurality of web pages,* wherein the snapshot comprises network addresses of the plurality of web pages along with stored display configuration settings for the network addresses, *the stored display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received...*

simultaneously displaying the web pages indicated by the stored network addresses according to the stored display configuration settings, wherein the displaying navigates to the portions of the web pages which were displayed at the time the snapshot indication was received, the portions corresponding to the scroll positions indicated by the stored configuration settings.

[Emphasis added.] For example, the Application describes an example of storing snapshots at page 18, lines 19-29:

The Snapshots menu 226 and its pull-down menus 910 provide the user with the capability of saving specific web pages (e.g. their URL addresses) and the configuration settings (such as locations of the horizontal scroll bar 256 and the vertical scroll bar 262) for their corresponding display panes 212a-212d. A "Take a Snapshot" menu selection 912 allows the user to save the URL addresses of displayed web page and configuration settings for the display panes 212a-212d exactly as they appear on the screen 116. This is analogous to the user "taking a picture" of the screen display 210 of the screen 116. The various HTML settings (such as the "<Toolbar2 = off>," "<Pane2L = 471>," and "<ScrollLeft2 = 0>" configuration settings illustrated in the preceding paragraphs) of the display panes 212a-212d as they appear are then saved in the storage area 136 for later recall and processing by the display processor 134.

The Application further describes an example process of receiving an indication to take a snapshot at page 21, lines 9-14:

At a start 1100 the user has retrieved data from one or more web sites and navigated to a desired location within each of the displayed web sites.... In step

1102, the user enables the snapshot mode by clicking on the “Take a Snapshot” menu selection 912 (see Figure 9). Alternatively, the user may enable the snapshot mode by the use of a keyboard combination ....

Additionally, at page 19, lines 13-30, the Application describes an example of displaying a previously-saved snapshot.

[T]he user simply selects one of the stored snapshots, and the display processor 134 automatically processes the saved configuration settings for that snapshot. The user need not make any further viewing adjustments – the web pages and display panes 212a-212d are displayed exactly as they were previously saved.

...[T]he URL or other indicia of the location of a web site or data storage location and configuration data are saved for future use.... When the current data is retrieved from the specified web pages (i.e., specified by the URLs) that current data is displayed in the display panes 212a-212d with the size, location and other characteristics of each display panel 212a-212d being displayed in accordance with the stored configuration settings.

Furthermore, the specific positions within those web pages, as determined by the configuration settings (e.g. the position of the scroll bars 256 and 262), are also recalled such that the user terminal 110 automatically navigates to the precise location within each web page.

Figure 9 of the application shows an example of a snapshot menu 910 containing a “Take a Snapshot” menu selection 912. In the example, choosing the “Take a Snapshot” selection causes a snapshot to be created which records the URLs of each of the panes 212a-212d, as well as display configuration settings, such as, for example, the location of the scroll bars 256 and 262 or the size of the panes 212a-212d.

Adams and Brisebois, individually and collectively, fail to teach or suggest “receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication from a user to store a snapshot of the plurality of web pages.” Additionally, Adams and Brisebois individually and collectively, fail to teach or suggest “after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication, storing a snapshot of the plurality of web pages.” According to MPEP 706.02(j), the prior art references must “teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” This requirement is not met, and, therefore, claim 44 should be allowed.

*Adams cannot teach or suggest “receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication” and “after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication, storing a snapshot of the plurality of web pages” with the snapshot comprising “stored display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received” as recited in claim 44 because Adams’ concept of storing a “predetermined group” of network locations requires*

*either manual creation or the following of links to create a “predetermined group.”* Adams, at Figure 7, and its accompanying text, describes the retrieval of a “predetermined group” of web pages. At column 12, lines 1-17, Adams describes how such a group is constructed, with reference to Figure 7:

Block 202 illustrates assigning a plurality of web pages to a predetermining group. The predetermined group can be defined by links on web pages or sublinks which are located on linked web pages. Alternately, the predetermined group of network locations could be created by a user in the bookmark pulldown menu within folders. Placing network locations into folders is a process which is well known by those having skill in the art.

Examples of such “predetermined groups” are found in Figure 5 and Figure 6. Figure 5 shows a web page containing three links to additional web pages. By selecting the “provide all displayed links” selection 102 of Figure 5, a set of web pages is displayed as a “predetermined group.” This is illustrated in Figure 6. As Adams explains at column 11, lines 39-42, “All linked web pages displayed in FIG. 5, or a predetermined group of web pages, are viewable concurrently on computer display 160 in response to the selection illustrated in FIG. 5.” Alternatively, Figure 5 illustrates that a “predetermined group” can be created by making a folder of bookmarks, as described in the passage of column 12 above.

Neither of these two methods identified in Adams teaches or suggests “receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication” or “after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication, storing a snapshot of the plurality of web page.” The linking method described by Adams cannot create the recited snapshot, because to operate it must search out and retrieve additional web pages, which changes which pages are presently displayed at the time of the request and preventing any stored information from “representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received” as recited in claim 44.

Additionally, the bookmark method also cannot teach or suggest the above-recited language because it requires additional effort on the part of a user to manipulate and populate a folder of bookmarks. Besides the additional effort required by Adams’ methods, the resulting bookmark may be in no way related to which web pages are displayed at the time the group is created and also cannot comprise “stored display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received.” For at least these reasons, Adams cannot teach or suggest the recited language of claim 44.

*Brisebois cannot teach or suggest the user of snapshots because Brisebois' "super-bookmarks" teach away from storing "display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received."* Brisebois is generally directed toward the creation of individual book marks, but also describes "super-bookmarks" which "permit the collaging of displays." (Column 7, lines 14-15.) However, these "super-bookmarks" do not describe snapshots in general and do not describe the above-quoted language of claim 44.

First, it is clear from Brisebois at column 7, line 59 to column 8, line 3 that the "super-bookmarks" do not describe snapshots as recited in claim 44:

In the context of the WWW, a super bookmark need not only contain enhanced bookmarks from different websites/servers. It may also contain enhanced bookmarks from the same website or web page. For instance, the first part of a superbookmark may point to a portion of a web page containing a search field/text entry field and send button. A second part of the superbookmark may point to the results page (usually referred to by a cgi) like <http://www.yahoo.com/search.cgi=<some text to search>> using either the post or get method (hidden or viewed sending of text field). This would allow the user a rapid method of initializing new searches without scrolling.

Thus, Brisebois describes creating "super-bookmarks" which are modifications of existing webpages. This teaches away from the "snapshot" including "stored display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received" as recited in claim 44.

*Brisebois additionally cannot teach or suggest the user of snapshots because Brisebois' method of creating "super-bookmarks" teaches away from "receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication" and "after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication, storing a snapshot of the plurality of web pages" as recited in claim 44 by requiring manual creation of "super-bookmarks."* Brisebois cannot teach or suggest the above-recited language because of its manual method of creating "super-bookmarks," as described at column 8, lines 4-12:

In the above super-bookmarking option, previously existing enhanced bookmarks or bookmarks are selected to create the superbookmark. Alternatively, the super-bookmark can be created in real time. A user may select a portion of a displayed page for example as shown in FIG. 5A and paste this portion into a "new super-bookmark" window such as shown in FIG. 5B. By doing this repeatedly, a "new-superbookmark" window such as shown in FIG. 5C may be generated.

Here, Brisebois shows that it requires the repeated pasting of other bookmarks to crate a super-bookmark. This teaches away from the idea of the "single user-initiated snapshot indication"

and “after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication, storing a snapshot of the plurality of web pages” as recited in claim 44 because it requires numerous user selections. Additionally, the piecemeal nature of this process also shows that Brisebois does not describe storage of “display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received.”

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully suggest that the requirement of MPEP 706.02(j) is not met, and, therefore, claim 44 is allowable over Adams and Brisebois. Further, Applicants do not find additional relevant disclosure in Staab or Matthews. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 44 as well as its dependent claims 45-55.

#### *Claim 56*

Independent claim 56, as amended, recites in part:

while displaying a plurality of user-selected web pages, the web pages being displayed according to user-selected display configuration settings and the display configuration settings including at least in part indications of portions of the web pages to be displayed, *receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication from a user to store a snapshot of the plurality of web pages;*

*after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication, storing the snapshot of the plurality of web pages, wherein the snapshot comprises network addresses of the plurality of web pages along with stored display configuration settings for the network addresses, the stored display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received...*

*simultaneously displaying the web pages indicated by the stored network addresses according to the stored display configuration settings, wherein the displaying navigates to the portions of the web pages which were displayed at the time the snapshot was received, the portions corresponding to the scroll positions indicated by the stored configuration settings.*

[Emphasis added.]

The Action relies on the same rationale and citations in rejecting claim 56 as it used in rejecting claim 44. For similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 44, Applicants respectfully suggest that the requirement of MPEP 706.02(j) is not met, and, therefore claim 56 is allowable over Adams and Brisebois. Further, Applicants do not find additional relevant disclosure in Staab or Matthews. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of this claim.

*Claim 57*

Independent claim 57, as amended, recites in part:

*receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication from a user to store a snapshot of the plurality of web pages and a user indication of a title for the snapshot;*

*after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication and indication of a title, storing the snapshot of the plurality of web pages, wherein the snapshot comprises the title, the respective network addresses and the display configuration settings including indications of the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages, the stored display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received;...*

*simultaneously re-displaying the plurality of web pages according to the stored display configuration settings, wherein the re-displaying displays a portion of at least one of the subsequently requested versions of the plurality of web pages corresponding to the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages as indicated by the stored display configuration settings.*

[Emphasis added.]

The Action relies on similar rationale and citations in rejecting claim 57 as it used in rejecting claim 44. For similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 44, Applicants respectfully suggest that the requirement of MPEP 706.02(j) is not met, and, therefore claim 57 is allowable over Adams and Brisebois. Further, Applicants do not find additional relevant disclosure in Staab or Matthews. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of this claim and of its dependent claims 58-64.

*Claim 65*

Independent claim 65, as amended, recites in part:

*receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication from a user to store a snapshot of the plurality of web pages and a user indication of a title for the snapshot;*

*after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication and indication of a title, storing the snapshot of the plurality of web pages, wherein the snapshot comprises the title, the respective network addresses and the display configuration settings including indications of the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages, the stored display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received;...*

*simultaneously re-displaying the plurality of web pages according to the stored display configuration settings, wherein the re-displaying displays a portion of at least one of the subsequently requested versions of the plurality of web pages*

corresponding to the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages as indicated by the stored display configuration settings.

[Emphasis added.]

The Action relies on the same rationale and citations in rejecting claim 65 as it used in rejecting claim 57. For similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 57, Applicants respectfully suggest that the requirement of MPEP 706.02(j) is not met, and, therefore claim 65 is allowable over Adams and Brisebois. Further, Applicants do not find additional relevant disclosure in Staab or Matthews. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of this claim.

#### *Claim 66*

Independent claim 66, as amended, recites in part:

*receiving a single user-initiated snapshot indication from a user to store a snapshot of the plurality of web pages and a user indication of a title for the snapshot;*

*after receiving the single user-initiated snapshot indication and indication of a title, storing the snapshot of the plurality of web pages, wherein the snapshot comprises the title, the respective network addresses and the display configuration settings including indications of the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages, the stored display configuration settings representing settings at the time the snapshot indication was received...*

*simultaneously re-displaying the plurality of web pages identified by the network addresses according to the stored display configuration settings....*

The Action relies on the same rationale and citations in rejecting claim 66 as it used in rejecting claims 57, 60, 61, and 63. For similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to these claims, Applicants respectfully suggest that the requirement of MPEP 706.02(j) is not met, and, therefore claim 66 is allowable over Adams and Brisebois. Further, Applicants do not find additional relevant disclosure in Staab or Matthews. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of this claim.

#### ***Request For Interview***

If any issues remain, the Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney prior to issuance of the next Office Action in order to arrange a telephonic interview. It is believed that a brief discussion of the merits of the present application may expedite



prosecution. Applicants submit the foregoing formal Amendment so that the Examiner may fully evaluate Applicants' position, thereby enabling the interview to be more focused.


This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

***Conclusion***

Claims 44-66 should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By   
Gregory L. Maurer  
Registration No. 43,781

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 226-7391  
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446